



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/808,690	03/25/2004	William James Temple	1092	2894
26749	7590	12/27/2006	EXAMINER	
DINSMORE & SHOHL LLP 900 LEE STREET SUITE 600 CHARLESTON, WV 25301			OSELE, MARK A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1734	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS	12/27/2006		PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/808,690	TEMPLE, WILLIAM JAMES	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mark A. Osele	1734	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 October 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,4-6 and 8-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1, 4-6, 8-9, 11-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1, 4-6, 8-9, 11-16, drawn to a pipe fusing and cleaning apparatus with three parallel plates, classified in class 156, subclass 281.
 - II. Claim 10, drawn to a pipe cleaning apparatus, classified in class 15, subclass 104.04.
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:
Inventions I and II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs for cleaning the outside surface of a pipe.
3. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. During a telephone conversation with Monica Hussel on December 19, 2006 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1, 4-6, 8-9, 11-16. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claim 10 is withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 4-6, 8-9, 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goto et al. in view of Thompson et al. and either King et al. or Chapman. Goto et al. teaches that it is important to use a scraper to clean the outer surface of a pipe prior to fusion welding the pipe to another pipe (column 4, lines 55-67; column 5, lines 7-11). Goto et al. fails to describe the scraper used in the fusing apparatus.

Thompson et al. shows a scraper for the outside surface of a pipe comprising two plates, 18, 20, movable from a closed position (Fig. 6) to an open position (Fig. 5) wherein a planar flexible wiper, 32, can be inserted or removed. The flexible wiper has an annular opening, 34, with a diameter, 36, slightly smaller than the outside diameter of the pipe. The plates hold the flexible wiper (column 3, lines 25-50). The plates

further include an annular ledge, 38, for holding the wiper in place (column 3, line 52-58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the scraper of Thompson et al. as the scraper in the fusing apparatus of Goto et al. because Thompson et al. shows this scraper to be effective in cleaning the outer surface of a pipe.

King et al. and Chapman each show pipe cleaning devices wherein a pair of annular plates (King et al.: 26, 28; Chapman: 14, 80) are separated by independent, removable spacers (King et al.: 44; Chapman: 22) such that the cleaning implements are disposed between the annular plates. King et al. teaches this arrangement to allow for quick changes of the annular plate and cleaning devices when cleaning pipes of different diameters (column 1, lines 11-19, 60-67; column 3, lines 39-60). Chapman teaches the similar arrangement to be able to be constructed around a pipe when an end of the pipe is not accessible, such as in a pipeline (column 3, line 57 to column 4, line 2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

8. Claims 1, 4-6, 8-9, 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably

convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The terms "discus plate" and "discus wiper" cannot be found in the originally filed specification. Any limitations directed at the shape of the plates and wiper of the drawings should be clearly defined in the specification.

9. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10. Claims 1, 4-6, 8-9, and 11-16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear what the limitation "discus" means as it is not described in the specification.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4-6, 8-9, 11-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Heumann et al., Halsey et al., Toelke et al., Schmidt, and Fowler all show pipe cleaning apparatuses with some of the instantly claimed features.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark A. Osele whose telephone number is 571-272-1235. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Fiorilla can be reached on 571-272-1187. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



MARK A. OSELE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

December 21, 2006